

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2003

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/964,408	09/28/2001	Kazuyoshi Sumiya	01-213	2358	
23400 7	7590 08/11/2003				
POSZ & BETHARDS, PLC			EXAMINER		
SUITE 10	BACON DRIVE		YAM, STE	YAM, STEPHEN K	
RESTON, VA	20190		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2878	-	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1		Application No.	Applicant(s)	M
	Advisory Action	09/964,408	SUMIYA, KAZUYOS	shi 🛴
Advisory Action		Examiner	Art Unit	<del> </del>
		Stephen Yam	2878	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
There final re condit	REPLY FILED 24 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TH fore, further action by the applicant is required to a ejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (ion for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appelination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application to the same of th	cation. A proper re	ply to a cation in
	<del></del>	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
b) Exhave be 37 CFR (b) abov	The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  The period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  The period for purposes of determining the period of exten 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened in the period for the period of the period of the shortened the period of the shortened patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. 136(a) and the appropriate fee. The appropriate ex the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in
1.	A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2.	The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:		
(a	) $\square$ they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);	
(b	) $\square$ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I	below);		
(c)	they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	terially reducing or s	simplifying the
(d	they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clain	ms.
• □	NOTE:	-At (-X)		
	Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	congrato, timoly filo	d amandment
	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).			
5.🛛	The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does No	OT place the
6.	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly
7.🛛	For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an
	The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
	Claim(s) allowed:			
	Claim(s) objected to:			
	Claim(s) rejected: 1,2 and 4-10.			
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 3.			
8.	The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disap	proved by the Exar	niner.
9.	Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	<del></del> •	
10.	Other:		,	

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive, the proposed amendment does not place the application in condition for allowance, thus the Advisory Action is proper.

DAVID PORTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800